

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.sispto.gov

			• •	
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/441,592	11/17/1999	KEITH E. LEJEUNE	99-041	CONFIRMATION NO.
759 HENRY E BA	02/11/2003		99-041	4572
LAW AND FINANCE BUILDING			EXAMINER	
429 FOURTH A PITTSBURGH, I	VENUE SUITE 1801 PA 15219		NAFF, DA	VID M
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1651	,
			DATE MAILED: 02/11/2003	l6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No. Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/41/592 le rune et d
. Omoc Action Summary	Examiner Haff Group Art Unit
—The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address-
Period for Reply	,
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	O EXPIREMONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE
<ul> <li>If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a</li> <li>If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default</li> </ul>	1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS apply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Arte, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status	
Responsive to communication(s) filed on	1,8/05
This action is <b>FINAL</b> .	(18/0)
accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 19	for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in
Disposition of Claims	7 0.5. 1 1, 400 0.d. 213.
· ·	
(Claim(s)	is/are pending in the application.
Of the above claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
☐ Claim(s)	is/are allowed.
Claim(s)	is/are rejected.
Claim(s) 3 + 4	is/are objected to
☐ Claim(s)	are subject to restriction or election
Application Papers	requirement.
$\ \square$ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawin	Review PTO-048
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is □ approved □ disapproved
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are object	ed to by the Examiner.
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	•
$\ \square$ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.	
riority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)	
<ul> <li>□ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority un</li> <li>□ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies of t</li> <li>□ received.</li> </ul>	e priority documents have been
☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Numbe	)
□ received in this national stage application from the Inte	
*Certified copies not received:	•
(Rochmoné/o)	
ttachment(s)	
☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No.	s) ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
• •	s) Interview Summary, PTO-413

U. S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 9-97)

Part of Paper No.

Application Number: 09/441,592 Page 2

Art Unit: 1651

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/18/02 has been entered.

The response of 11/18/02 presented arguments and a Declaration by Keith E. Lejeune, and stated that claims 2 and 11-30 have been canceled.

Claims 2 and 11-30 have been canceled, and claims examined on the 10 merits are 1 and 3-10 which are all claims in the application.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

15 Claims 1 and 5-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Havens et al for the type of reasons set forth in the previous office actions of 7/16/02 and 10/7/02.

The claims are drawn to a method of increasing loading of active enzyme immobilized in a polyurethane polymer by synthesizing the polymer in a reaction mixture containing water and enzyme to provide an enzyme 20 loading of the polymer of greater than approximately 0.1 percent by weight of the polymer, and including a sufficient amount of surfactant in the reaction mixture to increase enzyme activity at the enzyme loading.

Havens et al disclose immobilizing an enzyme in a polyurethane polymer by synthesizing the polymer in a reaction mixture containing the Application Number: 09/441,592 Page 3

Art Unit: 1651

enzyme and a surfactant. Loading of enzyme of at least 0.1 wt% would have been inherent in method of Havens et al since the polymer may contain 5 mg of protein per gram of prepolymer resin (page 2256, right col, line 17 from the bottom) which is 0.5 wt of protein%, and the crude enzyme extract is partially purified by ammonium sulfate precipitation (page 2256, left col, first complete paragraph). The surfactant used by Havens et al would have inherently provided increased enzyme activity at the enzyme loading.

## Response to Arguments

10 Applicant's arguments and declaration filed 11/18/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants urge that the 0.5 wt% protein in the polymer of Havens et al contains a much lower concentration of enzyme, and based on mathematical calculations presented in the declaration, assert that enzyme loading of the Havens et al polymer is only .0058 wt%.

The mathematical calculations are unpersuasive since they are based on the polymer of Havens et al containing 2.9 mg protein per g prepolymer whereas Havens et al disclose that 5 mg protein per g prepolymer may be present. Furthermore, the calculations are based on the rate of reduction in parathion concentration in Figure 1 of Havens et al. However, the rate of reduction in parathion content could have been affected by factors other than only the amount of active enzyme present in the polymer such as the ability of the parathion substrate to contact all active enzyme in the polymer. The polymer could have partially blocked access of the substrate to the entrapped enzyme. Therefore,

Application Number: 09/441,592

Art Unit: 1651

15

Page 4

there could have been substantially more active enzyme in the polymer than appears from the rate of substrate reduction. Furthermore, in addition to the active enzyme, there could have been a substantial amount of inactive enzyme in the polymer. The present claims do not require a certain amount of the loaded enzyme to be active enzyme. The present claims and specification do not require conditions different than used by Havens et al that would have resulted in greater enzyme loading than obtained by Havens et al.

Claims 3 and 4 are allowable, but are objected to as being dependent  $10\,$  on a rejected claim.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David M. Naff whose telephone number is (703) 308-0520. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and every other Friday from about 8:30 AM to about 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, a message can be left on voice mail.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Wityshyn, can be reached at telephone number (703) 308-4743.

The fax phone number is (703) 872-9306 before final rejection or (703) 872-9307 after final rejection.

Application Number: 09/441,592

Art Unit: 1651

Page 5

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

5

DMN 2/7/03

DAVID M. NAFF
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 128